

## REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 13, and 16-26 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. Claims 1-26 remain pending in this Application.

### Rejection of claims 1-12, 16, 19-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-12, 16, 19-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,596,739, to Kane et al. (Kane). In response, claims 1-10, 16, and 19-26 have been amended. Applicant respectfully submits that the amended claims are patentable over Kane.

Amended, claim 1 recites a processor comprising:

a control register to store a current privilege level for a task; and  
a privilege remapper coupled to the control register and adapted to dynamically remap the stored current privilege level. (emphasis added)

As recited in claim 1, a necessary feature of amended claim 1 is a privilege remapper adapted to dynamically remap the stored current privilege level (CPL) of a task. Once the CPL of a task is remapped to a new level, the task is allowed to execute with the new privilege level when the task executing instructions on its own requests. Kane failed to teach or suggest such a feature.

Instead, Kane disclosed a memory protection unit that can adjust the requested privilege level (RPL) of a called task to the current privilege level of a calling task (Col. 18, lines 51-54). However, **a RPL is not the same as a CPL**. In Kane, a RPL represents the privilege level of a routine (task) that requests an operation, whereas CPL is a privilege level assigned to an executing task by an operating system (Col. 10, lines 33-36; 40-46). In operation, the RPL is normally the

same as the CPL for a task when the task executing an instruction is the same as the task requesting the execution (Col. 10, lines 45-48). On the other hand, when a task is called to execute by another task, Kane teaches adjusting the RPL of the called task to the CPL of the calling task to avoid privilege conflicts. However, during such an adjustment, neither the CPL of the called task nor that of the calling task is ever adjusted. Thus, if the called task and the calling task execute on their own requests, the privilege levels of these two tasks would not change at all. Further, adjustment of the RPL to allow one task with one CPL be able to request service from another task with a different CPL, does not provide any motivation to one of ordinary skill to further provide the required dynamic adjustment of CPL, as such adjustment, when done improperly, is likely to undermine system stability. Thus, Applicant submits Kane failed to teach or suggest a privilege remapper adapted to dynamically remap the stored current privilege level. Accordingly, claim 1 is not obvious, and patentable over Kane, under sec 103(a).

Claims 7, 16, 19, 21, 23, and 25 are similar in substance to claim 1, and for at least the reasons stated above, are patentable over Kane, under sec 103(a).

Claims 2-6, 8-12, 20, 22, 24, and 26 are each dependent upon one of independent claims 1, 7, 19, 21, 23 and 25, and are patentable for at least the above-stated reasons over Kane, under sec 103(a).

#### Rejection of claims 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,916,385, to Parmar, in view of Kane.

Independent claim 13 contains in substance the same limitations as claim 1.

Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claim 13 is patentable over Kane. Parmar does not remedy the deficiency of Kane. Therefore, claim 13 remains patentable over Kane, even when combined with Parmar.

Claim 15 depends upon claim 13, and is patentable for at least above stated reasons.

#### Rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parmar. Claim 14 depends on claim 13 which is patentable over Kane and Parmar, as Parmar does not remedy the deficiency of Kane. So, for at least the same deficiency, claim 14 is patentable over Parmar.

#### Objection of claims 17 and 18

Claims 17 and 18 stand objected to for being dependent upon rejected base claims, but otherwise allowable. Claims 17 and 18 depend on claim 16. Since claim 16 is patentable over the cited references, claims 17 and 18 are patentable without having to be written in independent form.


#### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, claims 1-26 are in condition for allowance. Early issuance of the Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Please charge deposit account No. 500393, if there is any deficiency in fees required for the filing, and likewise credit the same account for any excess payment of fees.

Respectfully submitted,  
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT

Dated: September 7, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Al AuYeung  
Reg No. 35,432

Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900  
1211 SW Fifth Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: 503-222-9981